

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 7 are amended to incorporate the features of claims 16 and 17 and to even more clearly distinguish from the cited references; claims 4, 5 and 15 are amended for agreement with amended claims 1 and 7; and claims 16-18 are cancelled. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 7 can be found, for example, in Applicant's specification at page 20, line 19 - page 21, line 18. No new matter is added by the Amendment.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko (U.S. Patent No. 4,899,212) in view of Hieda (U.S. Patent No. 5,019,894). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kaneko even when modified in view of Hieda fails to disclose or render obvious the feature "the white balance adjuster multiplies each of the first, the second and the third digital image-capturing signals by an adjustment coefficient larger than 1" as recited in independent claim 1. This feature of claim 1 prevents a tinting phenomenon through the white balance adjustment. Additionally, the structure of the signal processing circuit is simplified since a circuit that performs multiplication using adjustment coefficients larger than 1 at all time is implemented with a structure more simple than that of a circuit engaged in both multiplication execution by adjustment coefficients larger than 1 and multiplication executed by using adjustment coefficients smaller than 1. Thus, a cost reduction is achieved. Kaneko in view of Hieda fails to disclose "the white balance adjuster multiplies...by an adjustment coefficient larger than 1." Hieda does not multiply the digital image-capturing singles by an adjustment coefficient larger than 1. See col. 4, line 50 - col. 5, line 45 and Fig. 5, step S4. The references also do not disclose (1) adjusting signal levels of analog signals followed by (2) white balance adjustment of digital signals obtained after A/D conversion of the adjusted analog signals. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify Kaneko in view of

Hieda to obtain the features recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 6, 13 and 15 are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko in view of Hieda and further in view of Kawada (U.S. Patent No. 4,883,360). Kawada does not overcome the deficiencies noted above for claim 1. Thus, claim 3 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko in view of Hieda and further in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,691,772). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kaneko when modified in view of Hieda and Suzuki fails to disclose or render obvious the claim 7 feature "the white balance adjuster multiplies each of the first, the second, and the third image-capturing signals by an adjustment coefficient larger than 1" as explained above regarding claim 1. Suzuki fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kaneko and Hieda. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify Kaneko in view of Hieda in further view of Suzuki to obtain the features recited in independent claim 7. The references also do not disclose (1) adjusting signal levels of analog signals followed by (2) white balance adjustment of digital signals obtained after A/D conversion of the adjusted analog signals. Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable, as are claims 4, 8, 10, 12 and 14, which depend from claims 1 or 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko in view of Hieda in view of Kawada in further view of Suzuki. Suzuki and Kawada fail to overcome the deficiencies of Kaneko and Hieda cited with respect to claim 1. Thus, claim 5 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko in view of Hieda and Suzuki in further view of Kawada. Kawada and Suzuki do not overcome the deficiencies of Kaneko and Hieda noted above for claim 7. Thus, claims 9 and 11 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Robert G. Bachner
Registration No. 60,122

MAC:RGB/jls

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 11, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--